

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

DANIEL GRANT,

PETITIONER,

vs.

STUART HUDSON, Warden,

RESPONDENT.

) CASE NO. 1:08CV815
)
) JUDGE SARA LIOI
)
) **ORDER**
)
)
)
)
)

Before the Court is the report and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge in the above-entitled action. Under the relevant statute:

Within fourteen days after being served with a copy, any party may serve and file written objections to such proposed findings and recommendations as provided by rules of court. A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made. [. . .]

28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). In this case, the fourteen-day period has elapsed and no objections have been filed. The failure to file written objections to a Magistrate Judge's report and recommendation constitutes a waiver of a de novo determination by the district court of an issue covered in the report. *Thomas v. Arn*, 728 F.2d 813 (6th Cir. 1984), *aff'd*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985), *reh'g denied*, 474 U.S. 1111 (1986); *see United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981).

The Court has reviewed the Magistrate Judge's report and recommendation and accepts the same. Accordingly, the petition for writ of habeas corpus is **DENIED** and the case is **DISMISSED**. Further, the Court **CERTIFIES** that an appeal from this decision could not be taken

in good faith and that there is no basis upon which to issue a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(a)(3), 2253(c); Fed.R.App.P. 22(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 15, 2010



HONORABLE SARA LIOI
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE